IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.K.DENESAN

THURSDAY, THE 4TH JANUARY 2007 / 14TH PAUSHA 1928

WP(C).No. 500 of 2007(H)

PETITIONER:

---

1. C.M.LEELA, W/O.LATE P.V.MATHEW,
   AGED 54 YEARS, OFFICE ATTENDANT GR.II,
   ELECTRICAL DIVISION, MUVATTUPUZHA,
   ERNAKULAM DISTRICT.

2. C.V.RAJAMMA, W/O.K.K.MOHAN,
   AGED 47 YEARS, OFFICE ATTENDANT GR.II,
   ELECTRICAL DIVISION, MUVATTUPUZHA,
   ERNAKULAM DISTRICT.

3. A.K.PUSHPA, W/O.GOPI M.S.,
   AGED 47 YEARS, OFFICE ATTENDANT GR.II,
   ELECTRICAL MAJOR SECTION, MUVATTUPUZHA,
   ERNAKULAM DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SRI.SABU FRANCIS

RESPONDENTS:

---

1. THE KERALA STATE ELECTRICITY BOARD,
   VYDYUTHI BHAVANAM, PATTOM P.O.,
   THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, REP. BY ITS SECRETARY.

2. THE CHIEF ENGINEER (HRM),
   K.S.E.BOARD, VYDYUTHI BHAVANAM,
   PATTOM P.O., THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

BY SC SRI.K.S.ANIL

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 04/01/2007,THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

K.K.DENESAN, J

W.P.(C)NO.500 of 2007

Dated this the 4th day of January, 2007

JUDGMENT

Heard the counsel for the petitioners and the Legal Laision Officer for the respondents.

2. The petitioners were appointed as temporary CLR workers. Later they were regularised as Office Attendants Grade II. On pay revision, arrear pay was given to the permanent employees from 1.8.1998, which is the date of effect of the Settlement. But the petitioners had not been given the pay arrears from 1.8.1998, because during that period they were CLR workers and they were regularised only in May 1999. Petitioners would submit that though their regularisation was w.e.f. 29.3.1999, that fact was recorded in their Service Book as May 1999, which is an anomaly, and therefore, the arrear pay was erroneously calculated from May 1999. Further, the petitioners had not been granted the surrender earned leave salary during the period of their CLR employment.

3. The respondents had granted the benefit of increments to certain CLR workers. Later orders were issued to recover the same from the concerned workers. This decision was kept in abeyance by the 2nd respondent until further orders. The petitioners have submitted

representations evidenced by Exts.P11 to P13 before the 2nd respondent stating the above facts.

2. The second respondent has not taken any decision on Exts.P11 to P13. In the circumstances, there shall be an order directing the second respondent to consider Exts.P11 to P13 and take appropriate decision and communicate the same to the petitioners within two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment.

The writ petition is disposed of as above.

K.K.DENESAN, JUDGE

css/